Telephone Conference 5/10/2017

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK				Page 1
In re:  BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT: SECURITIES LLC,  Debtor.  Debtor.  The rescale of the Liquidation of Bernard L. Madoff Investment: Securities LLC,  Plaintiff,  TRUST U/ART FOURTH O/W/O ISRAEL WILENITZ, individually, and as Trustee and Beneficiary of the Trust: U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel wilenitz, and  SARA SEIMS, as Trustee of the Trust U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz,  Defendants.  Defendants.  Defendants.  Defendants.  Defendants.  TELEPHONE CONFERENCE				
BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT : SIPA LIQUIDATION  SECURITIES LLC, : No. 08-01789 (SMB)  Debtor		-x		
SECURITIES LLC,  Debtor.  Debtor.  Securities L. MADOFF,  Debtor.  Defendants.  Defendants.  Defendants.  Defendants.  Defendants.  TELEPHONE CONFERENCE	In re:	:		
Debtor.  Debtor.  Substantively Consolidated)  In re:  BERNARD L. MADOFF,  Debtor.  Debtor.  TRVING H. PICARD, Trustee : for the Liquidation of Bernard L. Madoff Investment : 10-04995 (SMB)  Securities LLC,  Plaintiff,  V.  TRUST U/ART FOURTH O/W/O ISRAEL WILENITZ, : individually, and as Trustee and Beneficiary of the Trust : U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz, and  SARA SEIMS, as Trustee of : the Trust U/ART Fourth O/W/O ISrael Wilenitz, :  Defendants.  Defendants.:  Defendants.:  TELEPHONE CONFERENCE		: SIF	PA LIQUIDATION	
Consolidated)  In re: : :  BERNARD L. MADOFF, : :  Debtor. : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :		: No.	08-01789 (SMB)	
BERNARD L. MADOFF,  Debtor.:  TRVING H. PICARD, Trustee: for the Liquidation of Adv. Pro. No. Bernard L. Madoff Investment: Securities LLC,  Plaintiff,  V.  TRUST U/ART FOURTH O/W/O ISRAEL WILENITZ, individually, and as Trustee and Beneficiary of the Trust: U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz, and  SARA SEIMS, as Trustee of the Trust U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz,  Defendants.:  Defendants.:  Defendants.:  Defendants.:			——————————————————————————————————————	
Debtor. :  TRVING H. PICARD, Trustee : for the Liquidation of		:		
IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee for the Liquidation of Adv. Pro. No. Bernard L. Madoff Investment: 10-04995 (SMB) Securities LLC,  Plaintiff,  V.  TRUST U/ART FOURTH O/W/O ISRAEL WILENITZ, individually, and as Trustee and Beneficiary of the Trust: U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz, and  SARA SEIMS, as Trustee of the Trust U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz,  Defendants.:  Defendants.:  Defendants.:  Defendants.:  TELEPHONE CONFERENCE		:		
for the Liquidation of Bernard L. Madoff Investment: 10-04995 (SMB) Securities LLC,  Plaintiff,  V.  TRUST U/ART FOURTH O/W/O ISRAEL WILENITZ, individually, and as Trustee and Beneficiary of the Trust: U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz, and  SARA SEIMS, as Trustee of the Trust U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz,  Defendants.:  Defendants.:  Defendants.:  Defendants.:		-x		
TRUST U/ART FOURTH O/W/O ISRAEL WILENITZ, : EVELYN BEREZIN WILENITZ, : individually, and as Trustee and Beneficiary of the Trust : U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz, and :  SARA SEIMS, as Trustee of : the Trust U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz, :  Defendants. : TELEPHONE CONFERENCE	for the Liquidation of Bernard L. Madoff Investment	Adv		
TRUST U/ART FOURTH O/W/O ISRAEL WILENITZ, :  EVELYN BEREZIN WILENITZ, : individually, and as Trustee and Beneficiary of the Trust : U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz, and :  SARA SEIMS, as Trustee of : the Trust U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz, :  Defendants. : TELEPHONE CONFERENCE	Plaintiff,	:		
ISRAEL WILENITZ, :  EVELYN BEREZIN WILENITZ, : individually, and as Trustee and Beneficiary of the Trust : U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz, and :  SARA SEIMS, as Trustee of : the Trust U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz, :  Defendants. : X  TELEPHONE CONFERENCE	v.			
<pre>individually, and as Trustee and Beneficiary of the Trust : U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz, and :  SARA SEIMS, as Trustee of : the Trust U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz, :  Defendants. :</pre>		· :		
the Trust U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel Wilenitz, :  Defendants. :x  TELEPHONE CONFERENCE	individually, and as Trustee and Beneficiary of the Trust U/ART Fourth O/W/O Israel	:		
TELEPHONE CONFERENCE	the Trust U/ART Fourth O/W/O	:		
May 10, 2017	TELEPHONE CONFI	ERENCE		
	May 10, 20	)17		

```
Page 2
    IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee :
    for the Liquidation of
 2
    Bernard L. Madoff Investment: Adv. Pro. No.
                       10-04818 (SMB)
    Securities LLC,
 3
                 Plaintiff,
4
    v.
5
    TOBY HARWOOD,
6
                 Defendant.
              - - - - - - - x
    IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee :
                                   Adv. Pro. No.
    for the Liquidation of
    Bernard L. Madoff Investment: 10-04914 (SMB)
9
    Securities LLC,
10
                 Plaintiff,
11
    v.
    EDYNE GORDON, in her
12
    capacity as the executrix
13
    and primary beneficiary of
    the estate of Allen Gordon, :
14
                Defendant. :
     - - - - - - - - x
15
    IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee :
    for the Liquidation of Adv. Pro. No. Bernard L. Madoff Investment: 10-04826 (SMB)
16
    Securities LLC,
17
18
                 Plaintiff,
19
    v.
20
    ESTATE OF BOYER PALMER,
    DIANE HOLMERS, in her
21
    capacity as Personal
    Representative of the
22
    Estate of Boyer Palmer, and
    BRUCE PALMER, in his
23
    capacity as Personal
    Representative of the
24
    Estate of Boyer Palmer,
25
                 Defendants.
```

```
Page 3
     IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee : for the Liquidation of Adv. Pro. No. Bernard L. Madoff Investment: 10-04644 (SMB)
 2
      Securities LLC,
 3
                      Plaintiff ,
 4
      v.
 5
     RUSSELL L. DUSEK,
 6
                      Defendant.
      - - - - - - - - x
      IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee :
     for the Liquidation of Adv. Pro. No. Bernard L. Madoff Investment: 10-04541 (SMB)
 9
      Securities LLC,
10
                      Plaintiff,
11 v.
12 KENNETH W. PERLMAN; FELICE
     J. PERLMAN; and SANFORD S. :
13
     PERLMAN,
                    Defendants.
14
      - - - - - - - - - x
     IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee :
15
     IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee : for the Liquidation of Adv. Pro. No. Bernard L. Madoff Investment: 10-04728 (SMB)
16
      Securities LLC,
17
                      Plaintiff,
18
      v.
19
      BRUNO DIGIULIAN,
20
                    Defendant.
      - - - - - - - - - x
21
      IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee :
     for the Substantively Adv. Pro. No. Consolidated SIPA : 10-04905 (SMB) Liquidation of Bernard L.
23
     Madoff Investment Securities:
24
     LLC and Bernard L. Madoff,
25
                     Plaintiff,
```

Telephone Conference 5/10/2017

```
Page 4
 1
     v.
     TRAIN KLAN, a Partnership;
     FELICE T. LONDA, in her
     capacity as a Partner in
 3
     Train Klan; CLAUDIA HELMIG,
     in her capacity as a
     Partner in Train Klan;
     TIMOTHY LANDRES, in his
 5
     capacity as a Partner in
     Train Klan; JESSICA LONDA, :
 6
     in her capacity as a
     Partner in Train Klan;
 7
     PETER LONDA, in his
     capacity as a Partner in
     Train Klan; TIMOTHY HELMIG,
 9
     in his capacity as a
     Partner in Train Klan; and
     WENDY LANDRES, in her
10
     capacity as a Partner in
11
     Train Klan,
12
                  Defendants.
                                Х
     IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee
13
     for the Substantively
                                    Adv. Pro. No.
14
     Consolidated SIPA
                                :
                                     10-04621 (SMB)
     Liquidation of Bernard L.
     Madoff Investment
15
     Securities LLC and Bernard
16
    L. Madoff,
17
                  Plaintiff,
18
     v.
19
     DONALD A. BENJAMIN,
20
                  Defendant.
21
22
                  TRANSCRIPT of telephone conference
     as reported by SUSAN R. CHASTEK, a Certified Court
     Reporter, Registered Merit Reporter, and Notary
23
     Public of the State of New Jersey, on
     Wednesday, May 10, 2017, commencing at 8:30 a.m.
24
25
```

			Page 5
1	BEF	O R E:	
2		HON. FRANK MAAS (RET.), Arbitrator fmass@jamsadr.com	
3		620 Eighth Avenue 34th Floor	
4		New York, New York 10018	
5			
6	APP	EARANCES:	
7		BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP 45 Rockefeller Plaza	
8		14th Floor New York, New York 10111-0100	
9		(212) 589-4200 (212) 589-4201	
10		BY: DEAN HUNT, ESQ. dhunt@bakerlaw.com	
11		EDWARD L. JACOBS, ESQ. ejacobs@bakerlaw.com	
12		MARIE CARLISLE, ESQ. mcarlisle@bakerlaw.com	
13		For Irving Picard, Trustee	
14		CHAITMAN LLP 465 Park Avenue	
15		New York, New York 10022 (212) 698-3500	
16		(212) 698-3599 hchaitman@chaitmanllp.com	
17		BY: HELEN CHAITMAN, ESQ. For the Defendants	
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

	Page 6
1	JUDGE MAAS: Anybody else on the
2	line?
3	MR. HUNT: Your Honor, it's Dean
4	Hunt, Marie Carlisle and Ted Jacobs for the
5	Trustee. And we also have our court reporter on
6	as well.
7	JUDGE MAAS: Okay. So I guess
8	we're waiting for Ms. Chaitman?
9	MR. HUNT: That is correct, your
10	Honor.
11	MS. CHAITMAN: Helen Chaitman.
12	JUDGE MAAS: Good morning,
13	Ms. Chaitman. This is Judge Mass.
14	MS. CHAITMAN: Good morning. How
15	are you?
16	JUDGE MAAS: I'm well, thank you.
17	Why don't counsel for the Trustee identify
18	themselves as well.
19	MR. HUNT: Your Honor, this is Dean
20	Hunt with Baker Hostetler for the Trustee. I have
21	my colleagues Ted Jacobs and Marie Carlisle on the
22	line.
23	JUDGE MAAS: And just so you're
24	aware, Ms. Chaitman, there's also a court
25	reporter.

		rage /
1	I have read the letters submitted	
2	by both sides. I know that Mr. Digiulian, if I'm	
3	pronouncing it correctly, had the 16th affirmative	
4	defense and also the 37th affirmative defense in	
5	his answer. The 37th deals with mandatory	
6	withdrawals beyond the age of seventy and a half.	
7	The 16th relates to taxes that he paid on his	
8	fictitious return. I guess one question I have	
9	is, and I didn't have an opportunity to go look at	
10	the docket sheet yesterday, what other affirmative	
11	defenses, if any, is he asserting?	
12	MS. CHAITMAN: Well, it's Bruno	
13	Digiulian that is the widow is the defendant	
14	now. There are a number of as you can see, I	
15	mean, it goes way beyond 37. There are a lot of	
16	different affirmative defenses, and as we've	
17	indicated in other cases, virtually all of them	
18	are based on legal argument. The one that's	
19	related to the taxes in each case, Your Honor,	
20	we're following your procedure and we're getting a	
21	declaration from an accountant and producing the	
22	tax returns in the form that you ordered, so	
23	that's how we're dealing with that affirmative	
24	defense.	
25	The others are most largely based	

- 1 either upon the Trustee's documents which we're
- 2 still awaiting production on and on legal
- 3 argument.
- 4 JUDGE MAAS: Well, you say based
- 5 largely on either the Trustee's documents or legal
- 6 arguments. That suggests that they're not based
- 7 entirely on either the Trustee's documents or
- 8 legal argument, but you also said that you're
- 9 awaiting documents from the Trustee. I'm not sure
- 10 what that refers to.
- 11 MS. CHAITMAN: Well, as you may
- 12 recall, Judge, we have -- we claim that in fact
- 13 securities were purchased with the investment of
- 14 out-of-state customers' money and you've ordered
- 15 the Trustee to produce all of these microfiche
- 16 records and we're in the process of getting those
- 17 records and trying to put them in a readable
- 18 format which is a herculean task but we're working
- 19 through that right now. So we -- obviously, we're
- 20 going to be depending upon the Trustee's documents
- 21 for some of the affirmative defenses, but these
- 22 are all documents that have been in the Trustee's
- 23 possession since 2008.
- MR. JACOBS: Well, Your Honor, if I
- 25 may, this is Ted Jacobs. All of those records

- 1 from the microfiche film that Ms. Chaitman is
- 2 referring to have been produced in readable and
- 3 searchable format and they absolutely have nothing
- 4 to do with any of the affirmative defenses that
- 5 are at issue today or for which we would expect
- 6 documents and factual bases from the defendants,
- 7 so I'm not sure why she's raising that at this
- 8 juncture.
- JUDGE MAAS: Well, because she's
- 10 saying it's the pot calling the kettle black. But
- 11 a couple of things strike me.
- 12 First of all, to the extent
- 13 additional documents were produced and your letter
- 14 says they were produced within the -- back at the
- 15 discovery deadline, but I gather they were
- 16 produced far longer than 30 days after the
- 17 document request was served and, in fact, if I'm
- 18 reading the email correctly, they were produced
- 19 after the Trustee took the deposition; is that
- 20 correct?
- 21 MS. CHAITMAN: Yes. And I can
- 22 explain why, Your Honor. We had taken the
- 23 position, which I thought was accepted, that in
- 24 the event that a defendant conceded the accuracy
- of Exhibit B as to the deposits and withdrawals

- except for the Inter Account Transfer issue, that 1
- there was no reason for the defendant to have to 2
- produce the account statements which would 3
- evidence the deposits and withdrawals, so we had 4
- not produced them. Mrs. Digiulian was deposed for 5
- 6 about four hours, and at the deposition, she
- 7 explained that she had in fact sent the documents,
- but having reviewed the documents, I felt we could 8
- 9 concede the accuracy of Exhibit B and I hadn't
- produced them. And then when Ms. Carlisle asked 10
- 11 that they be produced, we did produce them.
- 12 we had followed the --
- 13 MR. HUNT: Your Honor, can I --
- JUDGE MAAS: Wait a minute. Let 14
- Ms. Chaitman finish, then I'll give you an 15
- 16 opportunity to speak. Go on.
- MS. CHAITMAN: You know, the issue, 17
- 18 Judge, is I had thought that so long as we
- 19 conceded the accuracy of Exhibit B, there was no
- reason to produce these documents, but if the 20
- 21 Trustee wants them in every case, we can produce
- It's not a problem. 22 them.
- 23 JUDGE MAAS: Okay. Now, was it
- 24 Mr. Hunt who was speaking?
- 25 MR. HUNT: Yes, sir.

		Page	11
1	JUDGE MAAS: Okay. Go ahead.		
2	MR. HUNT: Sure. This is Dean Hunt		
3	on behalf of the Trustee. What you're hearing		
4	there is a bit of revisionist history, I believe.		
5	The document requests were served April 1st of		
6	last year, 13 months ago. Ms. Digiulian testified		
7	in her deposition that she gave them to		
8	Ms. Chaitman last year sometime. Ms. Chaitman		
9	certainly had the documents in her possession in		
10	December when we had our hearing and certainly		
11	when you issued your orders in January. She could		
12	have produced the documents ten days after the		
13	order but she didn't. There was no agreement,		
14	implied or otherwise, that she was not required to		
15	produce documents. Instead, she let us go to		
16	Florida, take the deposition, where we learned		
17	that there were substantial quantities of		
18	documents directly relevant to this case. She's		
19	not withdrawn, as far as I know, any affirmative		
20	defenses in this case and she challenges, directly		
21	challenges the inter account transfers. There is		
22	no way that we can fully present our case without		
23	a subsequent deposition of Ms. Digiulian based on		
24	the documents that we received 13 months late in		
25	my office on Monday. So what she's telling you is		

- 1 just not accurate.
- JUDGE MAAS: Well, but you see
- 3 there's something of a tension between some of the
- 4 relief you seek and other relief you seek. Let me
- 5 be more specific.
- In part, you're seeking that
- 7 Ms. Chaitman and her client not be allowed to rely
- 8 on any other documents that may have been produced
- 9 in support of affirmative defenses, but yet at the
- 10 same time that you're seeking that preclusion
- order, you're also seeking the production of those
- 12 documents and a further deposition.
- 13 If she's precluded from using
- 14 additional documents, then it would seem to me
- 15 there's no purpose to be served by -- excuse me --
- 16 entering an order requiring a further production
- 17 and potentially a further deposition. Am I
- 18 missing something?
- 19 MR. HUNT: Yes, Your Honor. Again,
- 20 Dean Hunt. I believe you are.
- JUDGE MAAS: Okay.
- MR. HUNT: The -- the issue is
- 23 regardless of whether she can use those documents
- 24 for her affirmative defenses, whatever they're
- 25 going to be, as she mentioned, there are a whole

- 1 bunch of them, we still have the burden of proof
- 2 on our case in chief and the documents that we
- 3 received in my office on Monday directly relate to
- 4 those -- to our affirmative burden of proof.
- JUDGE MAAS: Are there documents
- 6 that you received that go beyond the account
- 7 records that the Trustee himself had?
- 8 MR. HUNT: Yes, sir. Absolutely.
- JUDGE MAAS: Well, anything you
- 10 wish to add, Ms. Chaitman?
- 11 MS. CHAITMAN: Yeah. You know,
- 12 I -- I've been through those documents and I don't
- 13 believe that they do anything further than confirm
- 14 the testimony of Mrs. Digiulian. She was
- 15 painstakingly taken through every deposit and
- 16 withdrawal and she conceded the accuracy of
- 17 Exhibit B except for the Inter Account Transfer,
- 18 so I'm not -- I'm not really sure what Mr. Hunt is
- 19 referring to but, you know, these are not
- 20 documents that we intended to use anyway because
- 21 we had conceded the accuracy of Exhibit B. So,
- 22 you know, from now on, if the Trustee wants all
- 23 the documents, that's fine, but there's no
- 24 incentive for us to concede anything. Why should
- 25 we relieve the Trustee of his burden of proof if

Page 14 there's no benefit to us in doing it? 1 2 JUDGE MAAS: Well, how did the 3 additional documents add to the picture, Mr. Hunt? MR. HUNT: Additional documents 4 being correspondence back and forth with BLMIS 5 6 directly related to deposits and withdrawals, 7 including the green cards confirming receipts of the documents -- of the letters. They have 8 9 substantial number of analyses of the accounts that were apparently done by Mr. Digiulian, we're 10 11 not sure who, but it shows, you know, how much he thinks he had, where it came from and so forth. 12 mean, it's a completely new set of documents that 13 are not in our files all directly related to these 14 15 accounts. 16 JUDGE MAAS: Well --17 MS. CHAITMAN: Well, what Mr. Hunt isn't saying is that they simply prove why we 18 conceded the accuracy of Exhibit B. You know, the 19 only factual issue is was each deposit and 20 21 withdrawal made, and the documents that we've now produced support the concession that we made. 22 23 That's why we made the concession, because our own 24 documents proved that Exhibit B was accurate 25 except for the Inter Account Transfer.

		Page 15
1	MR. HUNT: Whenever there's the	
2	word "except" involved in a concession, excuse me,	
3	it's not a concession.	
4	JUDGE MAAS: Well, I've heard	
5	enough in order to rule.	
6	Referring to my January Court Order	
7	which was entered January 9th, in my general	
8	ruling, paragraphs A $(2)$ and A $(3)$ dealt solely	
9	with a stipulation that would avert a particular	
10	defendant need excuse me. I'm not sick. I	
11	just seem to have something caught in my throat.	
12	Relate solely to a stipulation which had a number	
13	of parts and which would then avert the need to	
14	answer further interrogatories or amend the	
15	interrogatory answers, and as Mr. Hunt knows, it	
16	was an all or nothing proposition. In any event,	
17	those two paragraphs did not relate at all to the	
18	document request. In part, I think we didn't get	
19	to that because I mistakenly made the assumption	
20	that there would be a full stipulation in numerous	
21	cases, which as this case demonstrates did not	
22	occur.	
23	Paragraph C (1), which Ms. Chaitman	
24	refers to in her letter, related only to the	
25	particular defense concerning payment of taxes on	
Ī		

- 1 fictitious profits, the 16th affirmative defense.
- 2 So, and I also said that if there was a less than
- 3 complete stipulation and the dispute which seems
- 4 to be the circumstance here under paragraph A (4),
- 5 I said I would rule, it's quite clear, and I don't
- 6 see any ambiguity in my order, that other
- 7 affirmative defenses were not covered by the
- 8 order. It's also clear that the documents weren't
- 9 finally produced because notwithstanding what I
- 10 may have said or not said in January, the document
- 11 requests were served on April 1 of 2016, so the
- 12 responses were due and the documents were due long
- 13 before I got involved in the case.
- So my ruling is going to be that
- 15 the subsequently produced or recently produced
- 16 documents not be used to support their affirmative
- 17 defenses in the case, but that obviously does not
- 18 preclude Ms. Chaitman from using the Trustee's own
- 19 documents for whatever purpose she sees fit during
- 20 the trial of this case or in connection with
- 21 motion practice.
- 22 And in terms of the other relief
- 23 sought, the request for production of documents is
- 24 mooted because the documents have been produced.
- 25 As to the request for a further

Page 17 deposition, I question whether there's really a 1 need for one, but should there be a need for one, 2 I will permit such a further deposition to be 3 4 taken. So those are my rulings. Is there anything else I haven't 5 6 addressed today, Ms. Chaitman? 7 MS. CHAITMAN: Just in terms of --JUDGE MAAS: Ms. Chaitman? 8 9 MS. CHAITMAN: Just in terms of whether there's a need for a ruling, can we -- can 10 11 you require the Trustee to put in writing what the need is? Because if it's that we have to admit 12 that the letters were sent, we will admit that. 13 It doesn't have to be another deposition. This is 14 a woman who's in her eighties. She's a stroke 15 16 victim and I hate to put her through that again. 17 JUDGE MAAS: Well, I'm not going to make that ruling, but as I said, I question 18 whether there's a need for a further deposition. 19 If there is a need, perhaps it can be obviated 20 21 through stipulations. If the parties can't agree on whether or not a further deposition is 22 23 warranted, I certainly am willing to rule on that 24 issue, but I don't think I should impose a 25 requirement now. It seems to me that the parties

- 1 should confer about that, and if there's an issue,
- 2 you can bring it before me.
- 3 MR. HUNT: So, Your Honor, this is
- 4 Dean Hunt again. With respect to the deposition,
- 5 we have had, as Your Honor is aware, difficulty
- 6 getting deposition dates from Ms. Chaitman and her
- 7 firm. We're currently scheduled to be in Florida
- 8 for a deposition related to one of her cases on
- 9 May 23rd, I think. We believe that we can handle
- 10 Ms. Digiulian's deposition relatively quickly
- 11 during that same trip and would ask that you order
- 12 her to appear again in the location where we took
- 13 her deposition before, which were the
- 14 accommodations that we made at -- you know, in her
- 15 hometown on the 24th or 25th of May.
- JUDGE MAAS: Ms. Chaitman?
- 17 MS. CHAITMAN: I would ask that the
- 18 Trustee do what you just suggested, which is
- 19 submit in writing --
- MR. HUNT: No.
- 21 MS. CHAITMAN: -- the issues that
- 22 they need to address because I believe we can
- 23 stipulate to them.
- MR. HUNT: No. I've been -- Your
- 25 Honor, I've been trying to stipulate with

- 1 Ms. Chaitman for five years on things and I'm not
- 2 willing to do it anymore. If we need to take this
- 3 deposition, that's -- you know, we have to decide
- 4 what we need to do to present our case at trial.
- 5 We've looked at the documents. We believe that a
- 6 further deposition is needed on all of this new
- 7 stuff that we've got and we're going to be in her
- 8 hometown or within an hour of her hometown at the
- 9 end of May, and we could do this deposition
- 10 certainly within the four-hour window that, you
- 11 know, we talked about before. We've been
- 12 prejudiced. She allowed us to fly all the way to
- 13 Florida, take this deposition knowing she had the
- 14 documents in her office while she was sitting in
- 15 the office, in her office back in New York, and so
- 16 now we're going to have to fly to Florida again,
- 17 so --
- JUDGE MAAS: Well, whether
- 19 Ms. Chaitman knew or not, the salient fact is that
- 20 the documents were only produced after the
- 21 deposition, which is a rather unconventional
- 22 timing schedule for discovery.
- MR. HUNT: I agree.
- JUDGE MAAS: I am not going to
- 25 require that the Trustee provide you in advance in

- 1 effect with an outline of what it is he wishes to
- 2 pursue so that there can be a discussion about
- 3 whether those issues can be stipulated away. I
- 4 would encourage the two sides to talk about that.
- 5 As to the deposition, I would
- 6 imagine that there has to be considerable overlap
- 7 between what Ms. Chaitman produced to you and what
- 8 the Trustee already had and produced to
- 9 Ms. Chaitman, so what I'm tempted to do is -- how
- 10 long was the actual deposition of Ms. Digiulian?
- 11 MS. CHAITMAN: Approximately four
- 12 hours.
- MR. HUNT: It wasn't four hours.
- MS. CARLISLE: I was going to --
- 15 I'm sorry.
- JUDGE MAAS: Yes, Ms. Carlisle.
- 17 Were you starting to say something?
- MS. CARLISLE: Your Honor, this is
- 19 Ms. Carlisle. I can quarantee it was less than
- 20 four hours because I was there, but I'm currently
- 21 pulling up the deposition transcript to see if I
- 22 have the times. If not, I can certainly get with
- 23 the court reporting service.
- JUDGE MAAS: Well, that's not
- 25 critical. I take it from what you're saying in

Page 21 your uncertainty is that it was someplace between 1 2 three and four hours. Is that your statement? 3 MS. CARLISLE: Yes. Your Honor, it actually concluded at 12:24 p.m. and let me see if 4 I can find the time that it started. 5 6 apologies. It's taking my computer a moment. 7 went on the record at 10 a.m. so, Your Honor, it was two hours -- two hours and 24 minutes not just 8 9 deposition because we had a couple of breaks, but I would be willing to say it was about two hours 10 and 24 minutes according to the transcript. 11 12 JUDGE MAAS: Any objection to my saying that the continued deposition should be 13 limited to two hours? 14 15 MR. HUNT: No, Your Honor. I think 16 that, you know, that on-the-record time of two hours would be sufficient based upon our 17 preliminary review of the documents. I guess if 18 19 there was some reason that it took longer, we 20 could call you as you indicated in the past. 21 Okay. And I'm going JUDGE MAAS: to direct, Ms. Chaitman, that it occur on May 24th 22 23 unless I otherwise direct. So if there's some extraordinary problem and you can't work it out 24 with the Trustee, you can bring it to my 25

- 1 attention. But it seems to me in particular in
- 2 this situation, they should be back-to-back
- 3 depositions which also presumably serves your
- 4 interest in not having a second trip to Florida or
- 5 third I guess it would be.
- 6 MS. CHAITMAN: The only issue is I
- 7 just have to confirm it with the client, Your
- 8 Honor. I don't know if --
- JUDGE MAAS: That's why I said if
- 10 you can't -- if for some reason that date doesn't
- 11 work and you can't work it out with the Trustee,
- 12 you can let me know that.
- 13 Anything else from either side?
- MR. HUNT: Your Honor, we also
- 15 have -- this is Dean Hunt again for the court
- 16 reporter.
- 17 JUDGE MAAS: Yes.
- 18 MR. HUNT: We also have -- in your
- 19 file are letters related to Edyne Gordon.
- 20 Ms. Chaitman's firm, they had indicated that they
- 21 were going to respond to our letters on a couple
- 22 of different occasions, the most recently being by
- 23 May 1st, but no response has been received.
- 24 Again, this is one that we noticed a deposition
- 25 back in August of 2016, and your order indicated

- 1 that Ms. Gordon could be deposed. We're now again
- 2 faced with this stipulation with additional
- 3 requirements specifically saying that if they
- 4 stipulate to certain things, we're not allowed to
- 5 take any discovery on any other things. That
- 6 seemed inconsistent with your ruling and we would
- 7 just like you to reaffirm that Ms. Gordon's
- 8 deposition can go forward.
- 9 MS. CHAITMAN: Your Honor, this is
- 10 a similar situation. It's a woman in her eighties
- 11 who had nothing to do with her deceased husband's
- 12 account. We have conceded the accuracy of
- 13 Exhibit B. It was my understanding that if we did
- 14 that, there was no need for the deposition. But
- if I misunderstood Your Honor, then I will
- 16 obviously take that into consideration as we go
- 17 forward in terms of what I stipulate to, because
- 18 if there's no benefit to the client in making that
- 19 stipulation, there's no reason to relieve the
- 20 Trustee of his burden of proof.
- JUDGE MAAS: Well, that's your
- 22 decision to make. But, clearly, as I said
- 23 earlier, my ruling in paragraphs A (2) and (3) had
- 24 nothing to do with depositions or document
- 25 requests. It related only to interrogatories and,

- 1 therefore, first of all, if the Trustee wishes to
- 2 depose Mr. Gordon's widow, he's entitled to do
- 3 that and, obviously, from the discussion today, if
- 4 there are documents that have not been produced,
- 5 they need to be produced forthwith.
- MS. CHAITMAN: We will do that,
- 7 Your Honor.
- JUDGE MAAS: And given that, thank
- 9 you for calling to my attention, Mr. Hunt, that
- 10 there was no response by May 1st. But given that,
- is there any further need to address the Gordon
- 12 case?
- MR. HUNT: No. I think the only
- 14 issue there is going to be the timing of the
- 15 deposition. And, again, this is one we've been
- 16 waiting on for a long time. So if we could get a
- 17 deposition date sometime in June, Ms. Carlisle?
- MS. CARLISLE: Actually, this is
- 19 Ms. Carlisle. How would it -- could you -- does
- 20 Ms. Gordon still in Sante Fe, New Mexico?
- MS. CHAITMAN: Yes, she does.
- MS. CARLISLE: I just would like to
- 23 offer we will be in Sante Fe deposing her
- 24 accountant on August 10th, so I would prefer a
- 25 date either the day before or the day after that,

24

25

Page 25 if possible, so we could try to have them --1 2 again, do all this in one trip instead of having to make multiple trips to Sante Fe. 3 4 JUDGE MAAS: Is that a deposition you plan to attend in person, Ms. Chaitman? 5 6 MS. CHAITMAN: No. No. We've been 7 doing these by telephone, but I will try to 8 arrange that, Marie. 9 MS. CARLISLE: Okay. 10 JUDGE MAAS: Then why don't I say 11 that within one week, you'll notify the Trustee as 12 to whether you are able to do that. 13 MS. CHAITMAN: Sure. JUDGE MAAS: Anything else from the 14 15 Trustee? 16 MR. HUNT: No, sir. That concludes 17 our items for today. 18 JUDGE MAAS: Okay. Anything from 19 Ms. Chaitman? 20 MS. CHAITMAN: No. Thank you so 21 much, Judge. 22 JUDGE MAAS: Okay. Thank you all. 23 Have a good day.

Bye now.

MR. HUNT:

JUDGE MAAS:

Thank you, your Honor.

## 08-01789-cgm Doc 16079-1 Filed 05/25/17 Entered 05/25/17 16:17:54 Exhibit A Pg 26 of 37

Picard v Benjamin

Telephone Conference 5/10/2017

		Page	26
1	MS. CARLISLE: Thank you.		
2	(Conference concluded at 8:58 a.m.)		
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

		Page	27
1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION		
2			
3	I, SUSAN R. CHASTEK, Certified		
4	Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of		
5	New Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing		
6	is a true and accurate transcript of the telephone		
7	conference as taken stenographically by and before		
8	me at the time, place, and on the date		
9	hereinbefore set forth.		
10	I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am		
11	neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor		
12	counsel of any party in this action and that I am		
13	neither a relative nor employee of such attorney		
14	or counsel, and that I am not financially		
15	interested in the event nor outcome of this		
16	action.		
17			
18			
19			
20	SUSAN R. CHASTEK, CCR, RMR		
21	Certificate No. 30XI00079100		
22	Dated: May 10, 2017		
23			
24			
25			

Telephone Conference 5/10/2017

	16:1,7,16	arguments	11:3
a.m	age	8:6	believe
4:24 21:7 26:2	7:6	arrange	11:4 12:20 13:13 18:9
able	ago	25:8	18:22 19:5
25:12	11:6	asked	beneficiary
absolutely	agree	10:10	1:18 2:13
9:3 13:8	17:21 19:23	asserting	benefit
accepted	agreement	7:11	14:1 23:18
9:23	11:13	assumption	BENJAMIN
accommodations	ahead	15:19	4:19
18:14	11:1	attend	BEREZIN
account	Allen	25:5	1:17
10:1,3 11:21 13:6,17	2:13	attention	Bernard
14:25 23:12	allowed	22:1 24:9	1:4,8,12 2:2,8,16 3:2,8
accountant	12:7 19:12 23:4	attorney	3:16,23,24 4:14,15
7:21 24:24	ambiguity	27:11,13	beyond
accounts	16:6	August	7:6,15 13:6
14:9,15	amend	22:25 24:24	bit
accuracy	15:14	Avenue	11:4
9:24 10:9,19 13:16,21	analyses	5:3,14	black
14:19 23:12	14:9	avert	9:10
accurate	answer	15:9,13	BLMIS
12:1 14:24 27:6	7:5 15:14	awaiting	14:5
action	answers	8:2,9	Boyer
27:12,16	15:15	aware	2:20,22,24
actual	Anybody	6:24 18:5	breaks
20:10	6:1		21:9
add	anymore	B	bring
13:10 14:3	19:2	В	18:2 21:25
additional	anyway	5:1 9:25 10:9,19 13:17	BRUCE
9:13 12:14 14:3,4 23:2	13:20	13:21 14:19,24 23:13	2:22
address	apologies	back	Bruno
18:22 24:11	21:6	9:14 14:5 19:15 22:25	3:19 7:12
addressed	apparently	back-to-back	bunch
17:6	14:10	22:2	13:1
admit	appear	Baker	burden
17:12,13	18:12	5:7 6:20	13:1,4,25 23:20
Adv	Approximately	BANKRUPTCY	Bye
1:12 2:2,8,16 3:1,8,15	20:11	1:1	25:25
3:22 4:13	April	based	
advance	11:5 16:11	7:18,25 8:4,6 11:23	<u> </u>
19:25	Arbitrator	21:17	C
affirmative	5:2	bases	5:6 15:23
7:3,4,10,16,23 8:21 9:4	argument	9:6	call
11:19 12:9,24 13:4	7:18 8:3,8	behalf	21:20
11.17 12.7,2   13.1			
	1		•

Telephone Conference 5/10/2017

			Page 29
calling	Chaitman's	conference	day
9:10 24:9	22:20	1:24 4:22 26:2 27:7	•
			24:25,25 25:23
capacity	challenges	confirm	days
2:12,21,23 4:3,4,5,6,8	11:20,21	13:13 22:7	9:16 11:12
4:9,10	CHASTEK	confirming	deadline
cards	4:22 27:3,20	14:7	9:15
14:7	chief	connection	dealing
Carlisle	13:2	16:20	7:23
5:12 6:4,21 10:10	circumstance	considerable	deals
20:14,16,18,19 21:3	16:4	20:6	7:5
24:17,18,19,22 25:9	claim	consideration	dealt
26:1	8:12	23:16	15:8
case	CLAUDIA	Consolidated	Dean
7:19 10:21 11:18,20,22	4:3	1:7 3:22 4:14	5:10 6:3,19 11:2 12:20
13:2 15:21 16:13,17	clear	continued	18:4 22:15
16:20 19:4 24:12	16:5,8	21:13	Debtor
cases	clearly	correct	1:6,9
7:17 15:21 18:8	23:22	6:9 9:20	deceased
caught	client	correctly	23:11
15:11	12:7 22:7 23:18	7:3 9:18	December
CCR	colleagues	correspondence	11:10
27:20	6:21	14:5	decide
certain	commencing	counsel	19:3
23:4	4:24	6:17 27:12,14	decision
certainly	complete	couple	23:22
11:9,10 17:23 19:10	16:3	9:11 21:9 22:21	declaration
20:22	completely	court	7:21
Certificate	14:13	1:1 4:22 6:5,24 15:6	defendant
27:20	computer	20:23 22:15 27:4	2:6,14 3:6,20 4:20 7:13
CERTIFICATION	21:6	covered	9:24 10:2 15:10
27:1	concede	16:7	defendants
Certified	10:9 13:24	critical	1:22 2:25 3:14 4:12
4:22 27:3	conceded	20:25	5:17 9:6
certify	9:24 10:19 13:16,21	currently	defense
27:5,10	14:19 23:12	18:7 20:20	
Chaitman			7:4,4,24 15:25 16:1 <b>defenses</b>
	concerning	customers'	
5:14,17 6:8,11,11,13	15:25	8:14	7:11,16 8:21 9:4 11:20
6:14,24 7:12 8:11 9:1	concession	D	12:9,24 16:7,17
9:21 10:15,17 11:8,8	14:22,23 15:2,3	date	demonstrates
12:7 13:10,11 14:17	concluded	22:10 24:17,25 27:8	15:21
15:23 16:18 17:6,7,8	21:4 26:2	Dated	depending
17:9 18:6,16,17,21	concludes		8:20
19:1,19 20:7,9,11	25:16	27:22	depose
21:22 22:6 23:9 24:6	confer	dates	24:2
24:21 25:5,6,13,19,20	18:1	18:6	deposed

Telephone Conference 5/10/2017

			Page 30
10.5 22.1	doormont	ontound	· ·
10:5 23:1	document	entered	far
deposing	9:17 11:5 15:18 16:10	15:7	9:16 11:19
24:23	23:24	entering	Fe 24.20 22 25.2
deposit	documents	12:16	24:20,23 25:3
13:15 14:20	8:1,5,7,9,20,22 9:6,13	entirely 0.7	FELICE
deposition	10:7,8,20 11:9,12,15	8:7	3:12 4:2
9:19 10:6 11:7,16,23	11:18,24 12:8,12,14	entitled	felt
12:12,17 17:1,3,14,19	12:23 13:2,5,12,20,23	24:2	10:8
17:22 18:4,6,8,10,13	14:3,4,8,13,21,24	ESQ	fictitious
19:3,6,9,13,21 20:5	16:8,12,16,19,23,24	5:10,11,12,17	7:8 16:1
20:10,21 21:9,13	19:5,14,20 21:18 24:4	estate	file
22:24 23:8,14 24:15	doing	2:13,20,22,24	22:19
24:17 25:4	14:1 25:7	EVELYN	files
depositions	DONALD	1:17	14:14
22:3 23:24	4:19	event	film
deposits	due	9:24 15:16 27:15	9:1
9:25 10:4 14:6	16:12,12	evidence	finally
dhunt@bakerlaw.com	DUSEK	10:4	16:9
5:10	3:5	excuse	financially
DIANE		12:15 15:2,10	27:14
2:20	E	executrix	find
different	E	2:12	21:5
7:16 22:22	5:1,1,6,6	Exhibit	fine
difficulty	earlier	9:25 10:9,19 13:17,21	13:23
18:5	23:23	14:19,24 23:13	finish
Digiulian	EDWARD	expect	10:15
3:19 7:2,13 10:5 11:6	5:11	9:5	firm
11:23 13:14 14:10	Edyne	explain	18:7 22:20
20:10	2:12 22:19	9:22	first
Digiulian's	effect	explained	9:12 24:1
18:10	20:1	10:7	fit
direct	Eighth	extent	16:19
21:22,23	5:3	9:12	five
directly	eighties	extraordinary	19:1
11:18,20 13:3 14:6,14	17:15 23:10	21:24	Floor
discovery	either	∠1,∠ <del>T</del>	5:3,8
9:15 19:22 23:5	8:1,5,7 22:13 24:25	<b>F</b>	Florida
discussion	ejacobs@bakerlaw.c	$\overline{\mathbf{F}}$	11:16 18:7 19:13,16
20:2 24:3	5:11	5:1	22:4
dispute	email	faced	fly
16:3	9:18	23:2	19:12,16
DISTRICT	employee	fact	fmass@jamsadr.com
1:1	27:11,13	8:12 9:17 10:7 19:19	5:2
docket	encourage	factual	followed
7:10	20:4	9:6 14:20	10:12
/.10		,.o i ii = 0	10.12

Telephone Conference 5/10/2017

following	23:8,16	hereinbefore	13:24
7:20	goes	27:9	including
foregoing	7:15	history	14:7
27:5	going	11:4	inconsistent
form	8:20 12:25 16:14 17:17	HOLMERS	23:6
7:22	19:7,16,24 20:14	2:20	indicated
format	21:21 22:21 24:14	hometown	7:17 21:20 22:20,25
8:18 9:3	good	18:15 19:8,8	individually
forth	6:12,14 25:23	HON	1:18
14:5,12 27:9	Gordon	5:2	intended
forthwith	2:12,13 22:19 23:1	Honor	13:20
24:5	24:11,20	6:3,10,19 7:19 8:24	inter
forward	Gordon's	9:22 10:13 12:19 18:3	10:1 11:21 13:17 14:25
23:8,17	23:7 24:2	18:5,25 20:18 21:3,7	interest
four	green	21:15 22:8,14 23:9,15	22:4
10:6 20:11,13,20 21:2	14:7	24:7 25:24	interested
four-hour	guarantee	Hostetler	27:15
19:10	20:19	5:7 6:20	interrogatories
Fourth		5:7 6:20 hour	15:14 23:25
	guess 6:7 7:8 21:18 22:5	19:8	
1:16,19,21	0:7 7:8 21:18 22:3		interrogatory 15:15
FRANK	H	hours	
5:2	H	10:6 20:12,13,20 21:2	investment
full	1:11 2:1,7,15 3:1,7,15	21:8,8,10,14,17	1:4,12 2:2,8,16 3:2,8
15:20	3:21 4:13	Hunt	3:16,23 4:15 8:13
fully	half	5:10 6:3,4,9,19,20	involved
11:22	7:6	10:13,24,25 11:2,2	15:2 16:13
further	handle	12:19,20,22 13:8,18	Irving
12:12,16,17 13:13		14:3,4,17 15:1,15	1:11 2:1,7,15 3:1,7,15
15:14 16:25 17:3,19	18:9	18:3,4,20,24 19:23	3:21 4:13 5:13
17:22 19:6 24:11	HARWOOD	20:13 21:15 22:14,15	Israel
27:10	2:5	22:18 24:9,13 25:16	1:16,19,21
	hate	25:24	issue
<u>G</u>	17:16	husband's	9:5 10:1,17 12:22
gather	hchaitman@chaitm	23:11	14:20 17:24 18:1 22:6
9:15	5:16	т	24:14
general	heard	<u> </u>	issued
15:7	15:4	identify	11:11
getting	hearing	6:17	issues
7:20 8:16 18:6	11:3,10	imagine	18:21 20:3
give	Helen	20:6	items
10:15	5:17 6:11	implied	25:17
given	HELMIG	11:14	
24:8,10	4:3,8	impose	J
go	herculean	17:24	J
7:9 10:16 11:1,15 13:6	8:18	incentive	3:12
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Telephone Conference 5/10/2017

			Page 32	
Jacobs	LANDRES	5:2 6:1,7,12,16,23 8:4	money	
5:11 6:4,21 8:24,25	4:5,10	9:9 10:14,23 11:1	8:14	
January	largely	12:2,21 13:5,9 14:2	8:14 months	
11:11 15:6,7 16:10	7:25 8:5	14:16 15:4 17:8,17	11:6,24	
Jersey	late	18:16 19:18,24 20:16	mooted	
4:23 27:5	11:24	· ·	16:24	
	learned	20:24 21:12,21 22:9		
JESSICA		22:17 23:21 24:8 25:4	morning	
4:6	11:16	25:10,14,18,22,25	6:12,14	
Judge	legal	Madoff	motion	
6:1,7,12,13,16,23 8:4	7:18 8:2,5,8	1:4,8,12 2:2,8,16 3:2,8	16:21	
8:12 9:9 10:14,18,23	letter	3:16,23,24 4:15,16	multiple	
11:1 12:2,21 13:5,9	9:13 15:24	making	25:3	
14:2,16 15:4 17:8,17	letters	23:18	N	
18:16 19:18,24 20:16	7:1 14:8 17:13 22:19	mandatory		
20:24 21:12,21 22:9	22:21	7:5	N	
22:17 23:21 24:8 25:4	limited	Marie	5:6	
25:10,14,18,21,22,25	21:14	5:12 6:4,21 25:8	need	
juncture	line	Mass	15:10,13 17:2,2,10,12	
9:8	6:2,22	6:13	17:19,20 18:22 19:2,4	
June	Liquidation	mcarlisle@bakerlaw	23:14 24:5,11	
24:17	1:4,12 2:1,8,16 3:1,8	5:12	needed	
	3:15,23 4:14	mean	19:6	
K	LLC	7:15 14:13	neither	
KENNETH	1:5,13 2:2,9,17 3:2,9	mentioned	27:11,13	
3:12	3:16,24 4:15	12:25	new	
kettle	LLP	Merit	1:1 4:23 5:4,4,8,8,15	
9:10	5:7,14	4:23	5:15 14:13 19:6,15	
Klan	location	Mexico	24:20 27:5	
4:2,3,4,6,7,8,9,11	18:12	24:20	Notary	
knew	LONDA	microfiche	4:23 27:4	
19:19	4:2,6,7	8:15 9:1	noticed	
know		minute	22:24	
7:2 10:17 11:19 13:11	long 10:18 16:12 20:10	10:14	notify	
13:19,22 14:11,19	24:16		25:11	
18:14 19:3,11 21:16	· -	minutes	notwithstanding	
22:8,12	longer	21:8,11	16:9	
•	9:16 21:19	missing	number	
knowing 19:13	look	12:18	7:14 14:9 15:12	
	7:9	mistakenly		
knows	looked	15:19	numerous	
15:15	19:5	misunderstood	15:20	
L	lot	23:15	0	
L	7:15	moment	$\left  \frac{0}{0} \right $	
<b>.</b> ,		21:6	5:1	
	N #			
1:4,8,12 2:2,8,16 3:2,5	M M	Monday		
	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Monday 11:25 13:3	O/W/O 1:16,19,21	

Telephone Conference 5/10/2017

			Page 33
objection	13:15	plan	11:15
21:12	Palmer	25:5	produced
obviated	2:20,22,22,24	Plaza	9:2,13,14,16,18 10:5
17:20	paragraph	5:7	10:10,11 11:12 12:8
obviously	15:23 16:4	position	14:22 16:9,15,15,24
8:19 16:17 23:16 24:3	paragraphs	9:23	19:20 20:7,8 24:4,5
occasions	15:8,17 23:23	possession	producing
22:22	Park	8:23 11:9	7:21
occur	5:14	possible	production
15:22 21:22	part	25:1	8:2 12:11,16 16:23
offer	12:6 15:18	pot	profits
24:23	particular	9:10	16:1
office	15:9,25 22:1	potentially	pronouncing
11:25 13:3 19:14,15,15	parties	12:17	7:3
Okav	parties   17:21,25	practice	proof
6:7 10:23 11:1 12:21	Partner	16:21	13:1,4,25 23:20
		preclude	13:1,4,25 23:20   <b>proposition</b>
21:21 25:9,18,22 on-the-record	4:3,4,5,7,8,9,10 <b>Partnership</b>	preciude   16:18	proposition   15:16
on-the-record 21:16	4:2	precluded	
21:10 opportunity	parts	12:13	<b>prove</b> 14:18
7:9 10:16	15:13	preclusion	
7:9 10:16 <b>order</b>		preciusion 12:10	<b>proved</b> 14:24
11:13 12:11,16 15:5,6	<b>party</b> 27:12	prefer	provide
16:6,8 18:11 22:25		24:24	19:25
ordered	payment 15:25	prejudiced	Public
7:22 8:14	PERLMAN	19:12	4:23 27:4
7:22 8:14 orders	3:12,12,13	preliminary	pulling
11:11	3:12,12,13 <b>permit</b>	21:18	20:21
out-of-state	17:3		
8:14		<b>present</b> 11:22 19:4	purchased 8:13
	person 25:5		
outcome		presumably	purpose
27:15 outline	Personal	22:3	12:15 16:19
20:1	2:21,23 <b>PETER</b>	primary 2:13	pursue 20:2
	4:7	Pro 2:13	
overlap	Picard	-	<b>put</b>
20:6		1:12 2:2,8,16 3:1,8,15	8:17 17:11,16
P	1:11 2:1,7,15 3:1,7,15 3:21 4:13 5:13	3:22 4:13 <b>problem</b>	0
P		10:22 21:24	quantities
5:6,6	picture 14:3	procedure	11:17
<b>p.m</b>		7:20	question
21:4	place 27:8		7:8 17:1,18
paid	Plaintiff	process 8:16	quickly
7:7			18:10
painstakingly	1:14 2:3,10,18 3:3,10 3:17,25 4:17	<b>produce</b> 8:15 10:3,11,20,21	quite
h <del></del> 2.1	3.17,23 4.17	0.13 10.3,11,20,21	4446
		<u> </u>	l

Telephone Conference 5/10/2017

16:5	relative	RET	19:22
	27:11,13	5:2	scheduled
R	- relatively	return	18:7
R	18:10	7:8	searchable
4:22 5:1,6 27:3,20	relevant	returns	9:3
raising	11:18	7:22	second
9:7	relief	review	22:4
read	12:4,4 16:22	21:18	securities
7:1	relieve	reviewed	1:5,13 2:2,9,17 3:2,9
readable	13:25 23:19	10:8	3:16,23 4:15 8:13
8:17 9:2	rely	revisionist	see
reading	12:7	11:4	7:14 12:2 16:6 20:21
9:18	reported	right	21:4
reaffirm	4:22	8:19	seek
23:7		RMR	12:4,4
really	reporter		*
13:18 17:1	4:23,23 6:5,25 22:16	27:20	seeking
reason	27:4	Rockefeller	12:6,10,11
10:2,20 21:19 22:10	REPORTER'S	5:7	sees
*	27:1	rule	16:19
23:19	reporting	15:5 16:5 17:23	SEIMS
recall	20:23	ruling	1:20
8:12	Representative	15:8 16:14 17:10,18	sent
receipts	2:21,23	23:6,23	10:7 17:13
14:7	request	rulings	served
received	9:17 15:18 16:23,25	17:4	9:17 11:5 12:15 16:11
11:24 13:3,6 22:23	requests	RUSSELL	serves
record	11:5 16:11 23:25	3:5	22:3
21:7	require		service
records	17:11 19:25	S	20:23
8:16,17,25 13:7	required	S	set
referring	11:14	3:12 5:6	14:13 27:9
9:2 13:19 15:6	requirement	salient	seventy
refers	17:25	19:19	7:6
8:10 15:24	requirements	SANFORD	sheet
regardless	23:3	3:12	7:10
12:23		Sante	
Registered	requiring	24:20,23 25:3	shows
4:23	12:16	SARA	14:11
	respect	1:20	sick
relate	18:4		15:10
13:3 15:12,17	respond	saying	side
related	22:21	9:10 14:18 20:25 21:13	22:13
7:19 14:6,14 15:24	response	23:3	sides
18:8 22:19 23:25	22:23 24:10	says	7:2 20:4
relates	responses	9:14	similar
7:7	16:12	schedule	23:10

Telephone Conference 5/10/2017

simply	stipulate	11:16 19:2,13 20:25	9:23 10:18
14:18	18:23,25 23:4,17	23:5,16	three
SIPA	stipulated	taken	21:2
1:4 3:22 4:14	20:3	9:22 13:15 17:4 27:7	throat
sir	stipulation	talk	15:11
10:25 13:8 25:16	15:9,12,20 16:3 23:2	20:4	time
sitting	23:19	talked	12:10 21:5,16 24:16
19:14	stipulations	19:11	27:8
situation	17:21	task	times
22:2 23:10	strike	8:18	20:22
SMB	9:11	tax	timing
1:5,12 2:2,8,16 3:2,8	stroke	7:22	19:22 24:14
3:16,22 4:14	17:15	taxes	TIMOTHY
solely	stuff	7:7,19 15:25	4:5,8
15:8,12	19:7	Ted	TOBY
someplace	submit	6:4,21 8:25	2:5
21:1	18:19	telephone	today
	submitted	1:24 4:22 25:7 27:6	9:5 17:6 24:3 25:17
<b>sorry</b> 20:15	7:1	telling	7.5 17.0 24.5 25.17 <b>Train</b>
		11:25	
sought	subsequent 11:23	· -	4:2,3,4,6,7,8,9,11
16:23	· -	tempted	transcript
SOUTHERN	subsequently	20:9	4:22 20:21 21:11 27:6
1:1	16:15	ten	Transfer
speak	substantial	11:12	10:1 13:17 14:25
10:16	11:17 14:9	tension	transfers
speaking	Substantively	12:3	11:21
10:24	1:6 3:22 4:13	terms	trial
specific	sufficient	16:22 17:7,9 23:17	16:20 19:4
12:5	21:17	testified	trip
specifically	suggested	11:6	18:11 22:4 25:2
23:3	18:18	testimony	trips
started	suggests	13:14	25:3
21:5	8:6	thank	true
starting	support	6:16 24:8 25:20,22,24	27:6
20:17	12:9 14:22 16:16	26:1	Trust
State	sure	things	1:16,18,21
4:23 27:4	8:9 9:7 11:2 13:18	9:11 19:1 23:4,5	Trustee
statement	14:11 25:13	think	1:11,18,20 2:1,7,15 3:
21:2	SUSAN	15:18 17:24 18:9 21:15	3:7,15,21 4:13 5:13
statements	4:22 27:3,20	24:13	6:5,17,20 8:9,15 9:19
10:3		thinks	10:21 11:3 13:7,22,2
STATES	T	14:12	17:11 18:18 19:25
1:1	T	third	20:8 21:25 22:11
stenographically	4:2	22:5	23:20 24:1 25:11,15
27:7	take	thought	Trustee's

Telephone Conference 5/10/2017

			Page 36
8:1,5,7,20,22 16:18	7:15 11:22 19:12	17:11 18:19	2:8
try	we're		10-04995
25:1,7	6:8 7:20,20,23 8:1,16	X	1:12
trying	8:18,19 14:10 18:7	$\frac{1}{x}$	10018
8:17 18:25	19:7,16 23:1,4	1:2,6,10,23 2:7,15 3:7	5:4
	we've	3:14,21 4:12,20	10022
two		3.11,211.12,20	
15:17 20:4 21:8,8,10	7:16 14:21 19:5,7,11	Y	5:15
21:14,16	24:15 25:6	Yeah	10111-0100
U	Wednesday	13:11	5:8
	4:24	year	10th
U/ART	week	11:6,8	24:24
1:16,19,21	25:11	years	12:24
uncertainty	WENDY	19:1	21:4
21:1	4:10		13
unconventional	went	yesterday	11:6,24
19:21	21:7	7:10	14th
understanding	weren't	York	5:8
23:13	16:8	1:1 5:4,4,8,8,15,15	16th
UNITED	widow	19:15	7:3,7 16:1
1:1	7:13 24:2	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	1st
use	Wilenitz		11:5 22:23 24:10
12:23 13:20	1:16,17,19,21	0	
	willing	08-01789	2
V	17:23 19:2 21:10		2
V	window	1:5	15:8 23:23
1:15 2:4,11,19 3:4,11	19:10	1	2008
3:18 4:1,18	wish	1	8:23
victim	13:10	15:23 16:11	2016
17:16	wishes	10.11	16:11 22:25
virtually	20:1 24:1	1:25 4:24 21:7 27:22	2017
7:17	withdrawal		1:25 4:24 27:22
		10-04541	212
$\mathbf{W}$	13:16 14:21	3:8	5:9,9,15,16
$\mathbf{W}$	withdrawals	10-04621	23rd
3:12	7:6 9:25 10:4 14:6	4:14	18:9
Wait	withdrawn	10-04644	24
10:14	11:19	3:2	
waiting	woman	10-04728	21:8,11
6:8 24:16	17:15 23:10	3:16	24th
wants	word	10-04818	18:15 21:22
10:21 13:22	15:2	2:2	25th
warranted	work	10-04826	18:15
17:23	21:24 22:11,11	2:16	3
wasn't	working	10-04905	
20:13	8:18	3:22	3
	1	1 4 0 0 4 0 4 4	15:8 23:23
way	writing	10-04914	30

08-01789-cgm Doc 16079-1 Filed 05/25/17 Entered 05/25/17 16:17:54 Exhibit A Pg 37 of 37

Picard v Benjamin

Telephone Conference 5/10/2017

		Page 37
9:16		
30XI00079100		
27:20		
34th		
5:3		
<b>3.</b> 3		
7:15		
37th		
7:4,5		
4	_	
4		
16:4		
45		
5:7		
465		
5:14		
	_	
5	_	
589-4200		
5:9		
589-4201		
5:9		
6		
620		
5:3		
698-3500		
5:15		
698-3599		
5:16		
	_	
7		
	_	
8	_	
8:30		
4:24		
8:58		
26:2		
9	_	
	_	
9th		
15:7		
	<u> </u>	